

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 10-26 are allowed.

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly lacking patentable utility and/or a useful purpose. In the “Response to Arguments/Amendments” section of the office action, the office action alleges that claim 1 merely carries out calculations of a mathematical algorithm that are associated with pixel values but it fails to provide that the outcome of the calculations are either displayed on the display monitor or stored in the computer readable medium for further evaluations and that the calculations appear to be a series of mental steps. As Applicant previously noted, claim 1 refers to both a setup mode and a calculation mode neither of which can be mental steps. In addition, Applicant has amended the claims to include inherent language that the setup mode is a setup mode in a system (which may include any suitable structure, e.g. discrete logic and one or more processors etc. – see specification, page 14) and that the calculation mode is a mode of a system. Hence the steps described are steps carried out by a system. As such, the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

In addition, the office action indicates that claim 23 is now allowable since it recites writing and reading values to and from a temporary buffer which is a process that is different from carrying out a series of mental steps. Claim 2 requires writing the plurality of differential geometric values to a temporary buffer and reading the plurality of differential geometric values from the temporary buffer. Claim 23, which has been allowed, includes similar language and hence claim 2 should also be in condition for allowance for the same reason. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection with respect to claim 2.

The other dependent claims are also believed to be allowable since claim 1 is allowable.

Claim 27 notes that the system includes a processor and is also believed to be allowable.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8/15/05

By: C. Reckamp
Christopher J. Reckamp
Reg. No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601
PHONE: (312) 609-7599
FAX: (312) 609-5005